



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/471,869	12/23/1999	JEFFREY PHILLIPS	E0295/7130-(	8044

7590 04/28/2003

RICHARD F GIUNTA  
WOLF GREENFIELD & SACKS PC  
FEDERAL RESERVE PLAZA  
600 ATLANTIC AVENUE  
BOSTON, MA 022102211

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CAM LINH T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2171

DATE MAILED: 04/28/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/471,869	PHILLIPS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Cam-Linh T. Nguyen	2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

**A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.**

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 April 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 1, 3 - 8, 10 - 15, 17 - 24, 26 - 42, 44 - 45, 47 - 51, 53 - 56 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 11 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1, 3 - 8, 10, 12-15, 17 - 24, 26 - 42, 44 - 45, 47 - 51, 53 - 56 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 3 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                            4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                    5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_                    6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn, and the Amendment will be entered.

### *Claim Objections*

2. Claim 3 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Applicant defined claim 3 is depending on claim 2, but claim 2 was already cancelled.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 26 – 27, 30, 37, 53 - 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mosher, Jr. et al (U.S. 5,799,323).

◊ As per claim 26, 30, 37, 53, 56,

Mosher, Jr. et al (U.S. 5,799,323) discloses a computer system having at least first and second backup storage systems to each store backup data from at least one client (Fig. 2), comprising:

- “Receiving information related to backup activities of the second backup storage system at the first backup storage system” See Fig. 1 and 2. Mosher discloses a primary purpose of the RDF (Remote data facility) to handle backup activities from primary system with remote system (See col.6, line 34 – 38).
  - The information that being passed between the primary and the remote system is corresponding to “Information related to backup activities” (co. 6 line 59 – 65). This information is also corresponds to a “report” that written to the log maintained by the transaction management facility (See Fig. 1 element 104, col. 6 line 40 – 45, 59 – 65, Mosher).
  - “The second backup storage system” corresponds to “the remote backup system” (element 122 in Fig. 1, col. 6 line 47 - 49).
  - “The first backup storage system” corresponds to the “primary computer system” (element 110 in Fig. 1).
  - “A first controller … to receive information” corresponds to “the Extract Process 130” (See Fig. 1).
- ◊ As per claim 27,
  - “Transmitting the information related to the backup activities of the second backup storage system… to the first backup storage system” See col. 1 line 42 – 50.

- ◊ As per claim 54 – 55,
  - “Determining a lapsing of a time period” See col. 3 line 45 – 48.
  - “Automatically generating the report” See col. 7 line 1 – 3.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 3 – 8, 10, 12 – 15, 17 – 19, 21 – 24, 28 – 29, 31 – 36, 38 – 42, 44 – 45, 47 – 51, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mosher, Jr. et al (U.S. 5,799,323) in view of Kobayashi et al (U.S. 6,148,415).

- ◊ As per claim 1, 7, 12, 17, 22, 40, 44, 49,

Mosher, Jr. et al (U.S. 5,799,323) discloses a computer system comprising:

- “A plurality of backup storage systems” See Fig. 2, Mosher.
- “The first backup storage system” corresponds to the “primary computer system” (element 110 in Fig. 1).
- “The second backup storage system” corresponds to “the remote backup system” (element 122 in Fig. 1, col. 6 line 47 – 49, Mosher).
- “At least one user interface, coupled to at least the first and second backup storage systems” See Fig. 2 element 140, Mosher.

- Mosher teaches a system having a plurality of RDF systems (col.4 line 55 – 67, Mosher). Clearly, Mosher suggests using “a third backup storage system to store backup data from at least one client”.  
Mosher fails to teach about the “domain that includes at least the first and second backup storage systems and excludes the third backup storage system”.

However, Kobayashi, on the other hand, discloses a plurality of backup machines (See Fig. 2 of Kobayashi), where each operating machine is connected with their respective backup machine by a signed address (See col. 5 line 40 – 49, Kobayashi). Each backup machine only received the corresponding information from their operating machine. Clearly, Kobayashi teaches using a domain in backup operations.

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Kobayashi into the system of Mosher, because the teaching about the domain provides high benefits in access control between users and their backup system. In addition, it also provides fast access to the backup system by the address, and reduces the searching time for searching a respective backup system to backup data.

◊ As per claim 28 - 29, 31 – 32, 38 – 39, 8, 10, 13 – 15, 18 – 19, 21, 23 – 24, 41 – 42, 45, 47 – 48, 50 – 51,

Mosher teaches a system having a plurality of RDF systems (col.4 line 55 – 67, Mosher). Clearly, Mosher suggests using “a third backup storage system to store backup data from at least one client”.

Mosher fails to teach about the “domain that includes at least the first and second backup storage systems and excludes the third backup storage system”.

However, Kobayashi, on the other hand, discloses a plurality of backup machines (See Fig. 2 of Kobayashi), where each operating machine is connected with their respective backup machine by a signed address (See col. 5 line 40 – 49, Kobayashi). Each backup machine only received the corresponding information from their operating machine. Clearly, Kobayashi teaches about using a domain in backup operations.

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Kobayashi into the system of Mosher, because the teaching about the domain provides high benefits in access control between users and their backup system. In addition, it also provides fast access to the backup system by the address, and reduces the searching time for searching a respective backup system to backup data.

◊ As per claim 33 – 36, 3 – 6,

Since applying the teaching of Kobayashi into the system of Mosher, clearly, the combination teaches about an identifier to identify the user in the operating machine that have authorization access to the backup system.

“A second controller” corresponds to the “Receiver Process 132” (see Fig. 1 of Mosher).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

7. Claim 11 is allowed.

8. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: In independent claim 11, the limitation of allowing user to select via the interface a report on information related to backup activities, taken with the other limitations of the claim, were not disclosed by, would not have been obvious over, nor otherwise fairly disclosed by the prior art of record.

***Response to Arguments***

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3 – 8, 10 – 15, 17 – 24, 26 – 42, 44 – 45, 47 – 51, 53 - 56 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Fowler et al (U.S.6, 173,376) discloses a data backup and restore method and system in a multisystem environment.
- Woodhill et al (U.S. 5,649,196) discloses a system and method for distributed storage management on networked computer systems using binary object identifies.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cam-Linh T. Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305- 1951. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic, can be reached on (703) 308- 1436. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703- 746- 7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703- 305- 3900.

Cam-Linh Nguyen  
Art Unit 2171

LN



SAFET METJAHIC  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100